UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/578,779	05/09/2006	Jacques Leclercq	289274US6PCT	6166
22850 7590 08/10/2009 OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.			EXAMINER	
1940 DUKE ST	CREET	SZEWCZYK, CYNTHIA		
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		1791		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
		08/10/2009	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com oblonpat@oblon.com jgardner@oblon.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/578,779	LECLERCQ ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	CYNTHIA SZEWCZYK	1791	

	CYNTHIA SZEWCZYK	1791	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>22 July 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPL		-	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperfor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of a replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) \boxtimes The period for reply expires $\underline{5}$ months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE ').	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FII	n. LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. X The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered be	causo
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	nsideration and/or search (see NO		cause
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in beti appeal; and/or	•	ducing or simplifying tl	ne issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1:		ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mnliant Amendment (PTOL-324)
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		impliant Amenament (i	10L-32+).
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 		timely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>29-45,56 and 57</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>46-55</u> .			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ed.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/ Carlos Lopez/ Primary Examiner, Art U	Init 1791	

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Amended claim provides new limitation that creates new combinations that were not previously considered and would require further search and consideration.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The applicant argues on page that. Applicant argues on page 12 that NEDELEC does not teach a plurality of blowboxes however this is a newly added limitation that was not present in the examined claims. The applicant argues on page 13 that neither GULOTTA, JOHNSON '359, nor JOHNSON '246 teach a shaping bed with an arc of more than 90 degrees, however, NEDELEC is relied upon to teach this limitation. Applicant argues on page 14 that the glass does not strike an upper part of an idle roller while overturning, however, NEDELEC teaches that the half circle shaping bed comprises rods and counterrods (col. 7, lines 21-27), which indicates that the glass will roll past an upper counterrod which may be considered an idle roller and the rolling may be considered striking the rod. The glass sheet tilts when it contacts each of the rods and counterrods of the half-circle until it it completely overturned. The applicant argues on page 15 that the glass sheet is not overturned upon its release, however, since the glass would be upside down from its original orientation when it passes the final rods and counterrods, it is considered overturned upon its release.